

Meeting Summary

Statewide Water Analysis Network Workshop

Implementing California Water Plan Update 2005 Recommendation 11:
Improve Water Data Management and Scientific Understanding

Designing a Pilot Study to Improve Use of Data Produced for
Local, Regional, and Statewide Water Planning

Wednesday January 24th, 2007
9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
Bonderson Building, 1st Floor Hearing Room
901 P Street, Sacramento

Meeting Objectives

1. Describe Statewide Water Analysis Network (SWAN) and its roles in the next CWP Update.
2. Describe what DWR would like to accomplish with the pilot study.
3. Describe whom DWR would like to participate in the pilot study.
4. Present a preliminary scope of the pilot.
5. Discuss the objectives and preliminary scope with participants and receive feedback.
6. Refine preliminary scope to a draft scope to be distributed for review.

Summary of Discussion

1. Rich Juricich of DWR, DPLA welcomed everyone to the workshop and described the Statewide Water Analysis Network (SWAN) and their intended role as technical advisors to the upcoming California Water Plan Update.
2. Ken Kirby, a consultant to DWR, presented the context and objectives for the pilot study. A number of comments were offered and questions raised by the meeting participants. The attached pilot study description reflects the suggestions and discussion from the workshop.
3. Susan Lien Longville with the Water Resources Institute (WRI) at California State University San Bernardino (CSUSB) described efforts currently being discussed to study how plans can be used to develop a transparent strategy for how limited public resources can be applied to meet priorities for better development of infrastructure and investments in a sustainable, environmentally responsible water supply. Discussions to date have focused on Southern California needs and perspectives, but the group is interested in discussing better integration between North and South. There are a number of academic institutions participating in the discussion (USC, UCSB, UCLA and others). Susan

invites recommendations for other potential participants within the academic community. These discussions may lead to a symposium in the near future.

4. John Suen, Chief Hydrogeologist at the California Water Institute (CWI) at Fresno State, indicated interest in working with the potential symposium. He also described an effort that has begun with funding by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board to locate, compile, and share data related to water quality in the Central Valley, with a special emphasis on managing salinity problems.
5. Ken Kirby presented thoughts about ideal participants in the pilot study and a preliminary scope of the pilot study described in terms of potential tasks and methods to meet the objectives. Some participants emphasized the need to evaluate this data sharing (focused on meeting urban water demands in this pilot) within the context of supporting improvements across the full spectrum of information needs to perform Integrated Regional Water Management Planning.
6. Participants suggested that one group of planning entities be selected either from the Bay Area or Southern California and another group of entities be from the Central Valley due to the high expected growth pressures in the Central Valley.
7. Participants suggested that the pilot study not be designed as a “software development project”. They suggested that the primary focus for the pilot should be improved understanding of the needs, challenges, and a range of potential improvements to the use of information to meet future urban water demands.
8. Participants suggested that the pilot consider broader Integrated Regional Water Management needs beyond supply and demand, particularly water quality.
9. Participants want DWR be more specific about what it wants to get out of the Pilot study to improve its planning processes and to communicate this in the form of a letter to potential participants.
10. Participants would like to see the pilot include integration of information between state agencies, not just between local and state agencies.

Meeting Outcomes

1. The participants expressed an interest in seeing this pilot study move forward with the following qualifications:
 - a. Participants would like to see specific definition of what the state wants in terms of information and how the state plans to use the information gathered via reporting requirements.
 - b. Participants would like to see some tangible commitment from DWR stating that it is willing to work to revise reporting requirements to reflect recommendations that arise from this effort.
 - c. Participants are interested in supporting this effort if the resulting proposed changes reduce the difficulty of meeting reporting requirements and increase the usability of the gathered information for local, regional, and statewide planning.
2. Revised pilot objectives and proposed tasks and methods (attached in pilot description).
3. Invite representatives from the CA Public Utilities Commission and the Energy Commission to future SWAN meetings related to this topic.
4. DWR agreed to develop a list of next steps.
5. The participants agreed that one of the next steps will be to set up a leadership team to refine the scope of the pilot.

Next Steps

1. Revise pilot study objectives and potential tasks and methods. Distribute to SWAN members for review.
2. Define the State's interest in required data reporting related to this pilot.
3. Invite participants to serve on the pilot study leadership team (expecting that each leadership team member will meet approximately 3 times for 4 hours).
4. Work with members of the leadership team to define a specific project scope and work plan for the pilot study.

Meeting Participants

1. Shicha Chander, DWR
2. Joseph Chang, DWR
3. Les Chau, Kennedy Jenks
4. Gail Cismowski, Central Valley Water Quality Control Board
5. Sina Darabzand, DWR
6. Andy Draper, CALSIM
7. Chris Dunn, USACE - HEC
8. Jamie Dubay, DWR
9. Lloyd Fryer, Kern County Water Agency
10. Karen Gaffney, West Coast Watershed
11. Brandon Goshi, Metropolitan Water District of Southern CA
12. David Groves, RAND
13. Kristen Hard, Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation
14. John Headlee, USACE
15. Todd Hillaire, DWR – Northern District
16. Mike Hollis, Metropolitan Water District of Southern CA
17. Priyanka Jain, East Bay Municipal Utility District
18. Rich Juricich, DWR
19. Ken Kirby, Kirby Consulting Group, Inc.
20. Susan Lien Longville, Water Resources Institute (WRI) at California State University San Bernardino (CSUSB)
21. Ginger Lu, DWR
22. Jim Martin, Central Valley Water Quality Control Board
23. Behrooz Mortazavi, Eastern Municipal Water District
24. Chris Murray, Sonoma County Water Agency
25. Saquib Najmus, WRIME
26. Mansour Nasser, City of San Jose
27. Elizabeth Patterson, DWR
28. Roy Peterson, DWR – DES
29. Lisa Renton, Sonoma County Water Agency
30. Kim Rosmaier, DWR
31. Emilia Szczepankowska, East Bay Municipal Utility District
32. Mary Scruggs, DWR – DPLA
33. David Stang, Kirby Consulting Group, Inc.
34. John Suen, Fresno State University
35. David Sumi, Center for Collaborative Policy
36. Dawitt Tadesse, SWRCB
37. David Tucker, City of Merced
38. Brian Van Lienden, CH2M Hill
39. Jennifer Kofoed, DWR
40. Dave Todd, DWR
41. Kim Taylor, USGS
42. Robert Wilkinson, UC Santa Barbara
43. Hongbing Yin, DWR
44. Greg Young, Tully & Young, Inc.